

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. By the present amendment, claims 1-5 and 7-20 remain in the application while claims 1, 5, and 19 have been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled previously. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Claim 19 has been amended to be tied to a particular machine or apparatus. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 19 and 20 be withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,473,523 by Newman *et al.*, hereinafter “Newman”, and further in view U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0051575 by Myers *et al.*, hereinafter “Myers”. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons, although independent claims 1, 5, and 19 have been amended to distinguish further the claimed subject matter from the references.

Amended independent claim 1, in part, explicitly requires “a cursor information output unit, which outputs cursor position information showing a position of a character frame, wherein the character frame includes vertical marks and horizontal lines to be used for separating each of the individual characters of the plurality of characters in each character image”. Newman fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned limitations. As best understood by the applicants, the examiner reads the “viewfinder” (4) and the “cursor crosshairs” (90 and 92) in the Newman reference as the “character frame” in claim 1. However, amended claim 1 explicitly requires that

the character frame includes “vertical marks and horizontal lines to be used for separating each of the individual characters of the plurality of characters in each character image”. By contrast, neither the viewfinder nor the cursor crosshairs in the Newman reference includes vertical marks and horizontal lines used for recognizing each of the individual characters as set forth in claim 1. The viewfinder is used for displaying the whole character image (see col. 3, lines 20-26) but not for separating the individual character. The cursor crosshair is used for providing the coordinates of the whole character image (see col. 5, lines 6-13) but not for separating the individual character either. Furthermore, although Myers discloses tracking text regions (*i.e. a line of characters*) by rectangles (Figs. 4-6), Myers fails to disclose a character frame includes “vertical marks and horizontal lines to be used for separating each of the individual characters of the plurality of characters in each character image”.

Claim 1 further requires “a display that simultaneously displays a cursor, which includes the character frame, with the continuous still image at the time of capturing the continuous still image”. As stated above, Newman fails to disclose the character frame, and thus, fails to disclose the above-mentioned limitation. Myers, however, does not overcome the deficiency of the Newman reference. Myers discloses tracking text regions (*i.e. a line of characters*) by rectangles (Figs. 4-6) after capturing the image (see [0027] and [0028]), but does not disclose tracking the text regions at the time of capturing the image.

In view of the differences between the claimed subject matter and the cited references, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the references, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding independent claims 5 and 19, similar to the explanation above with respect to the patentability of claim 1, both Newman and Myers fail to teach or suggest all limitations as

required in claims 5 and 19. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 5 and 19 are allowable over the references, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 12, it further requires “a recognized character utilizing unit which utilizes the character information as the recognized result obtained by the character recognizing unit in accordance with a type of the character information”. The Office Action reads the viewfinder (4) of the Newman reference as the disclosure of the recognized character utilizing unit. Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion. The viewfinder, as stated by Newman, is merely a display of the captured or recognized text (see col. 3, lines 20-35), but does not have the function of utilizing the characters information in accordance with a type of the character information as set forth in claim 12. Meyers also fails to disclose the above-mentioned limitation. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable over the references, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 7-10, 17, 18, and 20 depend from any one of independent claim 1, 5, or 19, and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claims 1, 5, and 19.

Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Newman and Myers, and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0169923 by Butterworth. Claims 3 and 16 depend from either independent claim 1 or 5, and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claims 1 and 5.

Claims 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable the combination of Newman and Myers, and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0131636 by

Hou. Claims 11, 13, and 14 depend from independent claim 5, and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 5.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable the combination of Newman and Myers, and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,188,307 by Ohsawa. Claim 15 depends from independent claim 5, and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 5.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-37577.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

Date: October 09, 2009

By: /michaelwgarvey/  
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700